

Date: Sun, 3 Apr 94 04:30:10 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #160  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 3 Apr 94 Volume 94 : Issue 160

Today's Topics:

40 meter Broadcast QRM (5 msgs)  
Coord. priority for open repeaters  
Scaner laws in Northern VA?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

---

Date: Fri, 01 Apr 94 17:30:26 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!pacbell.com!uop!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!skyld!  
jangus@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: 40 meter Broadcast QRM  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Apr1.142818.25552@emba.uvm.edu> gdavis@grieffin.emba.uvm.edu  
writes:

> It's amazing that after years of IARU work we still must, more or less,  
> live with the megawatt AM broadcasters.

Yeah, good thing we'd never stoop to that.

I wonder where VOA have their antennas pointed?

Amateur: WA6FWI@WA6FWI.#SOCA.CA.USA.NOAM | "You have a flair for adding  
Internet: jangus@skyld.grendel.com | a fanciful dimension to any  
US Mail: PO Box 4425 Carson, CA 90749 | story."

Phone: 1 (310) 324-6080

| Peking Noodle Co.

---

Date: 1 Apr 1994 17:03:02 -0500  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!news.ans.net!hp81.prod.aol.net!  
search01.news.aol.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: 40 meter Broadcast QRM  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Apr1.142818.25552@emba.uvm.edu>, gdavis@griffin.emba.uvm.edu  
(Gary Davis) writes:

>>>  
...It was my understanding that all broadcasters  
were not allowed to beam to region two (N.A.)....  
<<<

Well, didn't we deliberately beam propaganda over to other countries ourselves?  
Cuba comes to mind, and RadioFreeEurope...

If the US does this, we can't reasonably complain when other do likewise.

Jose

---

Date: Sat, 2 Apr 1994 23:34:01 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa  
Subject: 40 meter Broadcast QRM  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <765221426snx@skyld.grendel.com> jangus@skyld.grendel.com (Jeffrey D.  
Angus) writes:

>  
>In article <1994Apr1.142818.25552@emba.uvm.edu> gdavis@griffin.emba.uvm.edu  
writes:  
>  
> > It's amazing that after years of IARU work we still must, more or less,  
> > live with the megawatt AM broadcasters.  
>  
> Yeah, good thing we'd never stoop to that.  
>  
> I wonder where VOA have their antennas pointed?

The VOA mostly uses remote xmtr sites close to their target countries.  
For example, their bcsts directed to Viet Nam are transmitted from  
a site in the Philippines. Antennas are oriented towards the target

countries.

Jeff NH6IL

---

Date: 3 Apr 94 02:28:22 GMT  
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!news.intercon.com!uhog.mit.edu!xn.ll.mit.edu!  
noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@ucbvax.berkeley.edu  
Subject: 40 meter Broadcast QRM  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Gary Davis <gdavis@griffin.emba.uvm.edu> writes:

>I've noted that Russia violates the region 2 rule with special English  
>language programs on several 40 meter frequencies, which they specifically  
>say is directed to North America.

Would you send in the Marines to capture the headquarters of Radio Moscow? How  
about a B-52 raid on the transmitter sites?

These are sovereign nations we're talking about here. There are no Mounties or  
FBI agents to "enforce" ITU regulations or any other international agreement in  
the way that a government enforces its own laws. We can yell, we can boycott,  
we can do any number of things to protest such a "violation," but if we act to  
prevent other nations from doing these things it would be an act of WAR just as  
it was when we blockaded Cuba, bombed Libya, drove the Iraqis out of Kuwait or  
if we sent in forces to wreck North Korea's nuclear facilities. You don't do  
that just because a broadcast station comes up on the "wrong" frequency!

>Why does there need be so many parallel transmitters? At least three  
>frequencies from Russia have the same program simultaneously.

The Russians, being so far north, have to beam their signals over the auroral  
zone to reach North America; they've always had problems with propagation for  
that reason. Radio Moscow used to be able to relay through Cuba to get around  
the problem, but apparently they don't any more. (Maybe if their next Gorizont  
had about a 100w NBFM transmitter in the 26 MHz band...)

---

Date: Sun, 03 Apr 1994 08:32:56 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!yeshua.marcam.com!zip.eecs.umich.edu!caen!  
malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: 40 meter Broadcast QRM  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <5a5NR7m.edellers@delphi.com>, Ed Ellers (edellers@delphi.com) writes:

>Gary Davis <gdavis@griffin.emba.uvm.edu> writes:  
>  
>>I've noted that Russia violates the region 2 rule with special English  
>>language programs on several 40 meter frequencies, which they specifically  
>>say is directed to North America.  
>  
>Would you send in the Marines to capture the headquarters of Radio Moscow? How  
>about a B-52 raid on the transmitter sites?  
>  
>These are sovereign nations we're talking about here. There are no Mounties or  
>FBI agents to "enforce" ITU regulations or any other international agreement in  
>the way that a government enforces its own laws. We can yell, we can boycott,  
>we can do any number of things to protest such a "violation," but if we act to  
>prevent other nations from doing these things it would be an act of WAR just as  
>it was when we blockaded Cuba, bombed Libya, drove the Iraqis out of Kuwait or  
>if we sent in forces to wreck North Korea's nuclear facilities. You don't do  
>that just because a broadcast station comes up on the "wrong" frequency!  
>  
>

Marines?! B-52 raids?! All Gary did was make an observation, Ed.  
And why the quotation marks around "violation"?

Mike, KK6GM

---

Date: Sat, 02 Apr 1994 01:55:00 EST  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!  
dan@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Coord. priority for open repeaters  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri) writes:

>Ed Ellers (edellers@delphi.com) wrote:  
>  
>: Which would seem to back up my assertion that a repeater licensee should be  
>: able to chase lids off without having to turn the repeater into what is  
>: generally considered a "closed" machine.  
>  
>Ed we are all curious ... do you use local repeaters in your area? How  
>do your local groups handle the obvious lid situations? If you have never  
>traveled on the Interstate Highways, you may be unaware of the dangers of  
>truckers that speed with overloaded vehicles ... they ignore the law.  
>There are many innocent victims. Those trucks keep on comming, so do the  
>lids. Don't tell us there are cops ... we all know they are never there  
>when you need them.

>  
>Bob

As much as I would like to take exception with that Bob, I can not. This is very unfortunate.

Dan N8PKV

--

"No free man shall ever be de-barred the use of arms. The strongest reason for the people to retain their right to keep and bear arms is as a last resort to protect themselves against tyranny in government."

-Thomas Jefferson

-----

Date: 2 Apr 1994 11:53:47 -0500  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!news.intercon.com!  
news1.digex.net!digex.net!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Scaner laws in Northern VA?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <jernandez-240394140524@jernandez.pbs.org> jernandez@pbs.org writes:

> Excuse the interruption. There is a law against carring scanners in  
> Northern VA ( and I am sure other states like NJ) unless you have a permit.  
> These permits are issued to volunteer rescue workers primarily. My question  
> is, "Are licensed Amateur radio operators excused from getting the permit?"  
> Thank you in advance.

I am unaware of any laws forbidding the use or posession of a scanner in a motor vehicle. And I live here.

Frank Ney EMT-A N4ZHG

--

"Apparently on New Texas, killing a politician was not malum in se, and was malum prohibitum only to the extent that what the politician got was in excess of what he deserved."

-H. Beam Piper, Lone Star Planet/A Planet For Texans

-----

Date: 28 Mar 94 05:42:00 GMT  
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.ans.net!  
malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@ucbvax.berkeley.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <p6z0gPq.edellers@delphi.com>, <mp3fntINNkl3@news.bbn.com>, <5i5Np6h.edellers@delphi.com>

Subject : Re: Coord. priority for open repeaters

Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

>Joel B Levin <levin@bbn.com> writes:

>

>>The owners/operators/trustees of the closed repeater can deny you the  
>>use of their repeater by closing it down. This they do at the cost of  
>>denying its service to other users, and it's a tradeoff as to whether  
>>it's worth doing that to keep the unwanted user off.

>>

>>On the other hand, that's about all they can do, and here's why. No

>

>So if I monitored the INPUTS of closed repeaters, measured their PLs with a  
>counter, then proceeded to work through those machines, I'm legal as long as  
>I don't cause interference?

No, you would be in violation of Part 97.

> What if I monitored inputs of autopatch-equipped  
>machines, decoded the DTMF codes being used and then proceeded to use the  
>patch without permission?

Again, violation of Part 97.

Dan N8PKV

--

"No free man shall ever be de-barred the use of arms. The strongest  
reason for the people to retain their right to keep and bear arms is  
as a last resort to protect themselves against tyranny in government."

-Thomas Jefferson

---

Date: 28 Mar 94 05:40:00 GMT

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.ans.net!  
malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@ucbvax.berkeley.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <22MAR199406565240@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>, <Cn5MDq.3Ht@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<5gxssWh.edellers@delphi.com>'

Subject : Re: Rich has flipped out (was: Morse Whiners)

Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

>Jeffrey Herman <jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu> writes:

>

>>Moral: Study the code and theory to get your HF access.

>  
>No, that is NOT the moral at all. The code test is an ARTIFICIAL requirement  
>imposed by bureaucrats at the FCC; it has nothing to do with working to  
>produce something of value to others in order to earn a reward from them.

Not the FCC. The HAMS! The FCC wants to drop the code tests (IMHO).

Dan N8PKV

--  
"No free man shall ever be de-barred the use of arms. The strongest  
reason for the people to retain their right to keep and bear arms is  
as a last resort to protect themselves against tyranny in government."  
-Thomas Jefferson

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #160  
\*\*\*\*\*